UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,062	09/05/2003	David S. Colvin	COL406PUS	2061

36547   7590   08/06/2007
BIR LAW, PLC
13092 GLASGOW CT.
PLYMOUTH, MI 48170-5241

EXAMINER
REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/605,062	COLVIN, DAVID S.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher A. Revak	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 May 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-86</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-86</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-86 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued by the applicant that the teachings of Ananda fail to disclose of a "software identifier that triggers an authentication and selective exchange of information".

The examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion, Ananda discloses of header software which is used to prevent unauthorized usage of the software and communicates with a rental security manager which makes the determination if the software is authorized or unauthorized for usage based on a series of tests, or authentication which are triggered based upon usage, see column 10, lines 4-15. The identifier of Ananda is an application identifier which is used in the authentication process of Ananda to determine if the software is authorized for usage based on comparison, see column 14, lines 35-63 and column 15, lines 21-37.

As per the remaining dependent claims, the Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Terminal Disclaimer

3.   The terminal disclaimer filed disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent

granted on this has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been

recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ananda, U.S Patent 5,495,411 in view of Grundy, U.S. Patent 5,291,598.

As per claim 1, Ananda teaches of a method for securing software to reduce

unauthorized use of the software, the method comprising providing software including

data representing digital content; associating at least one identifier with the software

prior to distribution of the software, the identifier being detectable by an authorized

representative to request authentication of the software; and distributing the software

with the at least one identifier to a user (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28; col. 4, lines 18-28;

col. 6, lines 57-63; and col. 10, lines 4-15). The teachings of Ananda fail to disclose of

allowing the software to function if authorization is not detected based on an identifier

not being detected. It is disclosed by Grundy of ownership details records being

reviewed and if there is no information in regards to a full-function mode, the software

will continue to operate (col. 5, lines 39-49). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply

controls for dictating software usage requirements. The teachings of Grundy recite of

motivational benefits by disclosing of the need to permit consumers to evaluate

products more efficient and to provide for means to protect against privacy (col. 4, lines

9-18). It is obvious the teachings of Ananda would have benefited from the disclosure

of Grundy in that further protection would have been added by allowing software to

function even if not in a fully operational mode.

As per claim 2, Ananda discloses wherein the software is self-activating and self-

authenticating in conjunction with an authorized representative located on or in the user

device (col. 10, lines 4-15).

As per claim 3, it is taught by Ananda wherein the digital content is selected from

the group consisting of data representing music, data representing video, instructions

executable by a computer, code for an application program, code for an operating

system, code for a game, data representing a movie, data representing graphics, data

representing watermarked works, data representing a magazine, and data representing

a book (col. 1, lines 17-19).

As per claim 4, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the identifier is hidden from the

user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 5, Ananda teaches wherein the identifier is tamper resistant to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 6, Ananda discloses wherein the at least one identifier is embedded within a file of at least one component of the software (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 7, it is taught by Ananda wherein the at least one identifier is a binary code (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 8, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the at least one identifier is encrypted (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 9, Ananda teaches wherein the step of distributing the software comprises electronically distributing the software (col. 3, lines 19-32).

As per claim 10, Ananda discloses wherein the step of distributing the software comprises distributing the software on a computer readable storage medium (col. 3, lines 57-63 and col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 11, it is taught by Ananda of performing a process to determine whether an attempted access to the software is authorized based on detection of the at least one identifier (col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 12, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the step of performing a process comprises determining whether the attempted access to the software is authorized based on registration information associated with the software (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 13, Ananda teaches wherein the step of performing a process comprises determining whether the attempted access to the software is authorized based on registration information associated with the software and registration information associated with a user device (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 14, Ananda discloses of communicating registration information to an authorized representative of the software; generating at least one authentication code based on the registration information; and associating the authentication code with the software (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 15, it is taught by Ananda wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by a user device (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 16, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by software (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 17, Ananda teaches wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by hardware (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 18, Ananda discloses wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by hardware and software (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 19, it is taught by Ananda wherein the at least one identifier is included in a filename for at least one component of the software (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 20, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the identifier is selected from the group consisting of the filename, a filename prefix, a filename suffix, a filename extension, a filename extension prefix, and a filename extension suffix (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 21, Ananda teaches wherein the identifier is tamper resistant to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 22, Ananda discloses wherein the identifier is hidden to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 23, it is taught by Ananda of a method for securing software to reduce unauthorized use of the software, the method comprising providing software including data representing digital content; associating a plurality of identifiers with the software prior to distribution of the software, at least one identifier being detectable by an authorized representative to request authentication of the software; and distributing the software with the plurality of identifiers to a user (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28; col. 4, lines 18-28; col. 6, lines 57-63; and col. 10, lines 4-15). The teachings of Ananda fail to disclose of allowing the software to function if authorization is not detected based on an identifier not being detected. It is disclosed by Grundy of ownership details records being reviewed and if there is no information in regards to a full-function mode, the software will continue to operate (col. 5, lines 39-49). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply controls for dictating software usage requirements. The teachings of Grundy recite of motivational benefits by disclosing of the need to permit consumers to evaluate products more efficient and to provide for means to protect against privacy (col. 4, lines 9-18). It is obvious the teachings of Ananda would have benefited from the disclosure of Grundy in that further protection would have been added by allowing software to function even if not in a fully operational mode.

As per claim 24, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the software is self-activating and self-authenticating in conjunction with an authorized representative located on or in the user device (col. 10, lines 4-15).

As per claim 25, Ananda teaches wherein at least one of the identifiers is an activation code that must be entered by the user prior to transferring the software (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 26, Ananda discloses wherein the digital content is selected from the group consisting of data representing music, data representing video, instructions executable by a computer, code for an application program, code for an operating system, code for a game, data representing a movie, data representing graphics, data representing watermarked works, data representing a magazine, and data representing a book (col. 1, lines 17-19).

As per claim 27, it is taught by Ananda wherein at least one of the at least one identifiers is hidden from the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 28, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein at least one of the at least one identifiers is tamper resistant to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 29, Ananda teaches wherein the at least one identifier is embedded within a file of at least one component of the software (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 30, Ananda discloses wherein the at least one identifier is a binary code (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 31, it is taught by Ananda wherein the at least one identifier is encrypted (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 32, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the step of distributing the software comprises electronically distributing the software (col. 3, lines 57-63 and col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 33, Ananda teaches wherein the step of distributing the software comprises distributing the software on a computer readable storage medium (col. 3, lines 57-63 and col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 34, Ananda discloses of performing a process to determine whether an attempted access to the software is authorized based on detection of the at least one identifier (col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 35, it is taught by Ananda wherein the step of performing a process comprises determining whether the attempted access to the software is authorized based on registration information associated with the software (col. 3, lines 21-29).

As per claim 36, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the step of performing a process comprises determining whether the attempted access to the software is authorized based on registration information associated with the software and registration information associated with a user device (col. 3, lines 21-29).

As per claim 37, Ananda teaches of communicating registration information to an authorized representative of the software; generating at least one authentication code based on the registration information; and associating the authentication code with the software (col. 11, lines 9-13).

As per claim 38, Ananda discloses wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by a user device (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 39, it is taught by Ananda wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by software (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 40, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by hardware (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 41, Ananda teaches wherein authorized representative functions are implemented by hardware and software (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 42, Ananda discloses wherein the at least one identifier is included in a file name for at least one component of the software (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 43, it is taught by Ananda wherein the identifier is selected from the group consisting of a filename, a filename prefix, a filename suffix, a filename extension, a filename extension prefix, and a filename extension suffix (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 44, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the identifier is tamper resistant to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 45, Ananda teaches wherein the identifier is hidden to the user (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 46, Ananda discloses of a method for securing software to reduce unauthorized use having at least one authorized representative entity installed on or in a user device, the method comprising associating at least one identifier with the software to designate the software for protection from unauthorized use; detecting the at least one identifier using the authorized representative installed on or in the user device;

determining whether the user device is authorized to access the software using the

authorized representative entity installed on or in the user device; and controlling

access to the software based on whether the user device is determined to be authorized

(col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28; col. 4, lines 18-28; col. 6, lines 57-63; and col. 10, lines 4-

15). The teachings of Ananda fail to disclose of allowing the software to function if

authorization is not detected based on an identifier not being detected. It is disclosed

by Grundy of ownership details records being reviewed and if there is no information in

regards to a full-function mode, the software will continue to operate (col. 5, lines 39-

49). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have been motivated to apply controls for dictating software usage

requirements. The teachings of Grundy recite of motivational benefits by disclosing of

the need to permit consumers to evaluate products more efficient and to provide for

means to protect against privacy (col. 4, lines 9-18). It is obvious the teachings of

Ananda would have benefited from the disclosure of Grundy in that further protection

would have been added by allowing software to function even if not in a fully operational

mode.

As per claim 47, it is taught by Ananda wherein the software is self-activating and

self-authenticating in conjunction with an authorized representative located on or in the

user device (col. 10, lines 4-15).

As per claim 48, it is disclosed by Ananda of determining whether the user device

is authorized to access the software using a remotely located authorized representative

entity in combination with the at least one authorized representative entity installed on or in the user device (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 49, Ananda teaches wherein the at least one authorized representative entity installed on or in the user device comprises a computer chip (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 50, Ananda discloses wherein the at least one authorized representative entity installed on or in the user device comprises program instructions executed by a microprocessor (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 51, it is taught by Ananda wherein the program instructions comprise an operating system component (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 52, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the program instructions comprise an application program (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 53, Ananda teaches wherein the program instructions comprise a driver for a secondary device (col. 10, lines 4-15).

As per claim 54, Ananda discloses wherein the step of determining whether the user device is authorized comprises comparing registration information associated with the user device to registration information associated with the software (col. 3, lines 16-49).

As per claim 55, it is taught by Ananda wherein the registration information associated with the software is embedded within an authentication code (col. 3, lines 24-28).

As per claim 56, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the registration information associated with the software is encrypted (col. 11, line 61 through col. 12, line 14).

As per claim 57, Ananda teaches wherein the registration information includes hardware information (col. 9, lines 5-6).

As per claim 58, Ananda discloses wherein the registration information includes hardware information associated with a unique user device (col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 59, it is taught by Ananda wherein the hardware information includes a serial number (col. 8, lines 18-23).

As per claim 60, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the registration information includes hardware information associated with a group of user devices (col. 3, lines 11-15).

As per claim 61, Ananda teaches wherein the authorized representative entity is installed by a manufacturer of the user device (col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 62, Ananda discloses wherein the authorized representative entity is installed from a computer readable storage medium (col. 6, lines 57-63 and col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 63, it is taught by Ananda wherein the authorized representative entity is installed from the software (col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 64, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the authorized representative entity is downloaded to the user device (col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 65, Ananda teaches wherein the authorized representative entity is transferred to the user device from a network (col. 9, lines 35-36).

As per claim 66, Ananda discloses wherein the step of controlling access comprises preventing the software from being transferred to a second user device (col. 10, lines 8-15).

As per claim 67, it is taught by Ananda wherein the step of controlling access comprises preventing the software from being transferred to a user device if at least one authorized representative is inaccessible (col. 10, lines 8-15).

As per claim 68, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the step of controlling access comprises preventing the software from being installed on a user device if at least one authorized representative is not present (col. 10, lines 8-15).

As per claim 69, Ananda teaches wherein the step of controlling access comprises preventing the software from being executed by the user device (col. 10, lines 8-15).

As per claim 70, Ananda discloses wherein the step of controlling access comprises providing limited access to the software (col. 10, lines 8-15).

As per claim 71, it is taught by Ananda wherein the software comprises digital content (col. 1, lines 17-19).

As per claim 72, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the software is selected from the group consisting of data representing music, data representing video, instructions executable by a computer, code for an application program, code for an operating system, code for a game, data representing a movie, data representing graphics, data representing watermarked works, data representing a magazine, and data representing a book (col. 1, lines 17-19).

As per claim 73, Ananda teaches wherein the software comprises instructions for generating at least one authentication code based on registration information associated with the user device (col. 11, lines 9-13).

As per claim 74, Ananda discloses wherein the software comprises instructions for encrypting the authentication code (col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, line 63 through col. 11, line 8).

As per claim 75, it is taught by Ananda of a method for securing software to reduce unauthorized use of the software, the method comprising providing software including data representing digital content; detecting an identifier associated with the software indicating that protection from unauthorized use is desired; communicating with an authorized representative entity to determine whether a user device attempting to access the software is authorized to access the software; and controlling access to the software based on whether the user device is authorized (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28; col. 4, lines 18-28; col. 6, lines 57-63; and col. 10, lines 4-15). The teachings of Ananda fail to disclose of allowing the software to function if authorization is not detected based on an identifier not being detected. It is disclosed by Grundy of ownership details records being reviewed and if there is no information in regards to a full-function mode, the software will continue to operate (col. 5, lines 39-49). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply controls for dictating software usage requirements. The teachings of Grundy recite of motivational benefits by disclosing of the need to permit consumers to evaluate products more efficient and to provide for means to protect

against privacy (col. 4, lines 9-18). It is obvious the teachings of Ananda would have

benefited from the disclosure of Grundy in that further protection would have been

added by allowing software to function even if not in a fully operational mode.

As per claim 76, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the software is self-activating

and self-authenticating in conjunction with an authorized representative located on or in

the user device (col. 10, lines 4-15).

As per claim 77, Ananda teaches wherein the identifier associated with the

software is contained within a filename for the software (col. 6, lines 57-65).

As per claim 78, Ananda discloses wherein the authorized representative entity is

a hardware device (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 79, it is taught by Ananda wherein the step of communicating with

the authorized representative entity comprises communicating with at least one

software module associated with the user device (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 80, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the authorized representative

entity is installed on the user device (col. 10, lines 4-15 and col. 11, lines 61-65).

As per claim 81, Ananda teaches of generating an authentication code based on

registration information associated with the user device; and associating the

authentication code with the software (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 82, Ananda discloses wherein the step of communicating comprises

generating an authentication code based on registration information associated with the

user device; and comparing the authentication code with a previously generated

authentication code associated with the software to determine if the user device is

authorized (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 83, it is taught by Ananda wherein the step of comparing the

authentication code comprises determining if at least a portion of system information

associated with the user device matches system information encoded within the

authentication code associated with the software (col. 3, lines 11-15 & 21-28).

As per claim 84, it is disclosed by Ananda wherein the registration information

includes hardware-specific information (col. 9, lines 5-6 and col. 8, lines 18-23).

As per claim 85, Ananda teaches wherein the authorized representative entity is

installed on or in the user device (col. 6, lines 57-63).

As per claim 86, Ananda discloses wherein the digital content is selected from

the group consisting of data representing music, data representing video, instructions

executable by a computer, code for an application program, code for an operating

system, code for a game, data representing a movie, data representing graphics, data

representing watermarked works, data representing a magazine, and data representing

a book (col. 1, lines 17-19).

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-

272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CR

August 2, 2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER